May 14, 2001   LB 465

after we get to the next amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Wickersham.   We're discussing the
committee amendments to LB 465.   Senator Wickersham,   we
are...Senator Wickersham, you're recognized. Amendment to the
committee   amendments.   (AM2027,   Legislative   Journal
pages 2017-2020.)

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: All right.   Mr. President and members of
the body, this amendment should be appearing on your machine
momentarily.   Ah-ha, there we are.   Since it's up on the board
and you have an amendment number, you should now be able to
access with...with your machine.   I'm sorry about the rather
short notice for this amendment.   It's the result of discussions
between myself and other persons who had participated in the
earlier debate. We hope that you find this proposal agreeable.
As I noted earlier, what the amendment does is cause the size of
TERC to be increased by one person to four persons.   The one
additional person would be an at-large appointee, and the
amendment does require that the commission be composed of two
lawyers   and   two   laypersons.   We're not disturbing the
qualification criteria that were the subject of the Landis
amendment.   We're not disturbing the ability of the TERC
commission as a whole to meet in panels of three as provided in
the committee amendments. The sole substance of this amendment
is to cause the size to be four rather than three, and to cause
the composition to be two lawyers and two laypersons as opposed
to one lawyer and two laypersons as the current composition
stands.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Open for discussion on AM2027?   Senator
Landis, followed by Senators Wehrbein and Bromm.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature,
I'll support the Wickersham AM2027. Understand that what I care
about in LB 465 generally is elsewhere, and I'm glad to see that
we're going to attend to this. Hopefully, Senators Wehrbein and
Wickersham are on the same side at this point.   The use of
referees I support; the new language that will affect the burden
of proof I support; the training language that's in there I
support; the use of the Attorney General potentially by a county